

REMARKS

Claims 1, 5, 41, 82, 85, 87, 89, 92, and 98 are currently amended and claims 1-13, 41-50, 82-92, 98-101, and 103 remain in the application for consideration. In view of the remarks and amendments herein, Applicant
5 respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of the subject application.

Interview Summary

Applicant's attorney, Chris Culberson, wishes to thank Examiner Rachna Singh for discussing this application over the phone on March 31 and April 10, 2008.

10 During these discussions, Applicant's attorney and Examiner Singh discussed several issues from the Office Action of February 4, 2008. First, the § 101 rejections of claims 1-13 were discussed. Without conceding the propriety of these rejections, Applicant's attorney proposed a claim amendment to address the rejections. Examiner Singh indicated that the amendment would overcome the
15 § 101 rejections. Accordingly, Applicant has amended claim 1 as discussed during the interview.

Second, the § 112, second paragraph, rejections of the claims were discussed. Without conceding the propriety of these rejections, Applicant's attorney proposed a claim amendment to facilitate prosecution. Examiner Singh
20 indicated that the amendment would overcome the § 112, second paragraph, rejections. Accordingly, Applicant has amended the claims as discussed during the interview.

Finally, the § 103(a) rejections of the independent claims were discussed. While no agreement was reached with respect to these rejections, Applicant's
25 attorney has considered the Examiner's comments in crafting this response.

In light of these discussions, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner contact Applicant's attorney to discuss this application before issuing any subsequent rejections.

§ 101 Rejections

Claims 1-13 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101 for allegedly being directed to non-statutory subject matter. Without conceding the propriety of these rejections, Applicant has amended claim 1 as discussed during the examiner interview. The Examiner agreed that these amendments obviate the ground for the Examiner's rejection of these claims under § 101. Applicant respectfully requests that the § 101 rejections of claims 1-13 be withdrawn.

§ 112 Rejections

Claims 1-13, 41-50, 82-92, 98-101, and 103 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, allegedly for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim certain subject matter. While Applicant respectfully disagrees with these rejections, Applicant amends certain claims as discussed during the examiner interview. Applicant submits that the claims herein comply with the requirements of § 112, second paragraph, and respectfully requests that these rejections be withdrawn.

Rejections under § 103

Claims 1-13, 41-43, 50, 82-92, 98, 101, and 103 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Laura Acklen & Read Gilgen (hereinafter "Acklen"), Using Corel WordPerfect 9, 251-284, 424-434, 583-586 (1998), in view of Webopedia Computer Dictionary (hereinafter "Webopedia"), pages 1-7 (and newly added supplemental page 1 (available at www.pcwebopedia.com)).

Claims 44-49 and 99-101 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Acklen in view of Webopedia and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,630,126 to Redpath.

The Claims

Independent claim 1 is amended, and as amended recites an architecture embodied on one or more computer-readable storage media, the architecture comprising [added language is indicated in underline]:

- a table appearance manager to manage how a table appears in a document, the table having a cell capable of being interpreted as word-processing based or as spreadsheet based; and
- a spreadsheet functionality manager to manage spreadsheet functions for the table, the functions comprising: determining whether the cell is word-processing based or spreadsheet-based and treating an enter key typed into the cell as meaning a return command in the event that the cell is interpreted as word-processing based or as meaning a command to navigate to another cell in the event that the cell is interpreted as spreadsheet-based,
- wherein the table appearance manager and the spreadsheet functionality manager are architecturally separate system managers of the architecture.

The Office rejected claim 1 allegedly for being obvious over Acklen in view of Webopedia. Applicant respectfully disagrees with this rejection and submits that the Office has failed to establish a prima facie case of obviousness for at least the reason that the cited combination of references fails to disclose or suggest all of the features recited in claim 1.

For example, neither reference discloses or suggests the feature of determining whether a cell is word-processing based or spreadsheet-based. In its rejection of claim 1, the Office argues that Acklen discusses this particular feature on page 431. To aid in this discussion, Applicant has provided below the section of Acklen that is cited by the Office as allegedly discussing this particular feature of claim 1:

Ignoring Values in Text Cells

5 *I created an invoice using a table, but when I calculate the total due, it's always wrong. I checked the formulas and they're all correct.*

10 Check to see if your formula includes a text cell, and whether that text cell contains any numbers. WordPerfect ignores text and uses the numeric value of a cell that contains both text and numbers. For example, if you're adding an entire column, and the top cell contain[s] an invoice number, the value of the invoice number is added to the total of the column.

15 To avoid this problem, right-click the cell, choose Format, and in the Cell tab of the Table Format dialog box, choose Ignore Cell When Calculating. Then recalculate the table, and the formula should now yield the correct result.

20 Applicant submits that this section of Acklen makes no mention of the above-mentioned feature of claim 1. This section of Acklen simply discusses that WordPerfect, when it encounters a formula that includes a text cell, ignores text in the cell and uses a numeric value of a cell that contains both text and numbers. In utilizing this functionality, WordPerfect is simply capturing numbers from a cell that contains "both text and numbers". It is not making a determination as to the
25 nature of the cell, i.e., whether a cell is word-processing based or spreadsheet-based, as recited in claim 1.

The Office further argues in the "Response to Arguments" section of the office action that:

30 [The] Examiner believes the feature in WordPerfect allowing a cell to be ignored as a spreadsheet based cell and processed as a word-processing based cell combined with the feature of "return commands" (as disclosed by Webopedia) teaches the claimed invention as set forth in the rejections above.

35

In this argument, the Office appears to be relying on Acklen's discussion that WordPerfect allows a user to tell a formula to "Ignore Cell When Calculating" (discussed above) as discussing the feature of claim 1 of "determining whether the cell is word-processing based or spreadsheet-based." However, as discussed
5 above, Acklen is not making a determination as to the nature of the cell, e.g., whether a cell is word-processing based or spreadsheet-based. Further, Acklen discusses that a user expressly designates that a cell should be ignored when a formula is calculated.

In contrast, Applicant's claim 1 recites that a spreadsheet functionality
10 manager that is part of the claimed architecture determines whether the cell is word-processing based or spreadsheet-based. This further distinguishes the subject matter of claim 1 from the cited references. Even if Acklen did disclose or suggest the ability to determine whether a cell is word-processing based or spreadsheet-based (which it does not), it would rely on a user's express
15 designation of the cell type and not a determination by a spreadsheet functionality manager (e.g., in Acklen, the user would "right-click the cell, choose Format, and in the Cell tab of the Table Format dialog box, choose Ignore Cell When Calculating").

Accordingly, and at least for the above-mentioned reasons, the Office has
20 failed to establish a prima facie case of obviousness with respect to claim 1 and claim 1 is allowable.

Claims 2-13 depend from claim 1 and thus are allowable as depending from an allowable base claim. These claims are also allowable for their own recited features which, in combination with those recited in claim 1, are neither
25 disclosed nor suggested by the references of record.

Independent claims 41, 82, 85, 87, 89, 92, and 98 each recite one or more variations of the feature of determining whether a cell is word-processing based or spreadsheet-based. Each of these claims has been rejected allegedly for being obvious over Acklen in view of Webopedia. However, as discussed above, this

combination of references fails to disclose or suggest the feature of determining whether a cell is word-processing based or spreadsheet-based. Accordingly, and at least for this reason, Applicant submits that the Office has failed to establish a prima facie case of obviousness with respect to independent claims 41, 82, 85, 87, 89, 92, and 98, and these claims are allowable.

Dependent claims 42-50, 83-84, 86, 88, 90-91, 99-101, and 103 each depend from one of the independent claims discussed above and thus are allowable as depending from an allowable base claim. Each of these claims is also allowable for its own recited features which, in combination with those recited in the independent claim from which it depends, are neither disclosed nor suggested by the references of record.

The Office has further rejected dependent claims 44-49 for allegedly being obvious over Acklen in view of Webopedia and further in view of Redpath. However, as discussed above, the combination of Acklen and Webopedia fails to disclose or suggest all of the features of independent claim 41, from which claims 44-49 depend. The addition of Redpath fails to remedy this deficiency. Accordingly, and at least for this reason, Applicant submits that the Office has failed to establish a prima facie case of obviousness with respect to dependent claims 44-49 and these claims are allowable.

The Office has further rejected dependent claims 99-100 for allegedly being obvious over Acklen in view of Webopedia and further in view of Redpath. However, as discussed above, the combination of Acklen and Webopedia fails to disclose or suggest all of the features of independent claim 98, from which claims 99-100 depend. The addition of Redpath fails to remedy this deficiency. Accordingly, and at least for this reason, Applicant submits that the Office has failed to establish a prima facie case of obviousness with respect to dependent claims 99-100 and these claims are allowable.

Conclusion

All of the claims are in condition for allowance. Accordingly, Applicant requests that the Office issue a Notice of Allowability. If the Office's next anticipated action is to be anything other than issuance of a Notice of Allowability,

5 Applicant respectfully requests a telephone call for the purpose of scheduling an interview.

Respectfully Submitted,

10 Dated: May 5, 2008

By: /Christopher J. Culberson/
Christopher J. Culberson
Reg. No. 59,136
(509) 755-7266